

DP-307433 / DI-3-0292-P

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-26, 28-47, 49-68, and 70-94 remain in the present application. Claims 49, 93, and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21, 28, 31, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Andonian et al. Claims 6, 7, 25, 26, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 52, 53, 54, 57 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Andonian and Stout et al. Claims 67, 68, 70, 71, 77, 78, 81, 91 and 92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap. Claims 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian in view of Kaufmann et al and Demerly et al. Claim 42 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Stout as combined for claim 6 and further in view of Millsap. Claims 45-47, 55, 56, 50, 51, 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Stout et al as combined for claim 40 and further in view of Kaufmann and Demerly as combined with Andonian for claims 3-5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22-24, 29, 30 and 32-34. Claims 72-74, 79, 80 and 82-84 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap et al as combined for claim 67 and further in view of Kaufmann and Demerly as combined with Andonian for claims 3-5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22-24, 29, 30 and 32-34. Claims 75 and 76 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap as combined for claim 67 and further in view of Stout as combined with Andonian for claims 6, 7 and 40.

Claims 17-19, 35-37, 61-66, and 85-90 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. However, the Examiner has indicated that claims 17-19, 35-37, 61-66, and 85-90 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's amenability to allow these claims. Claims 17, 35, 61, and 85 have been cancelled and incorporated into independent base claims 1, 20, 38, 39, 40, 67, 91, and 92. Claims 93, and 94 have also been cancelled. Claims 1, 20, 24, 38, 39, 40, 49, 62, 64, 67, 86, 88, 91, and 92 have been amended. The Applicants submit that claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-26, 28-34, 36-47, 49-60, 62-68, 70-84, and 86-92 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons presented herein. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

DP-107433 / DE3-0292-P

Claim Objections

Claims 24 and 38 have been objected to due to informalities. Claims 24 and 38 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicants submit that claims 24 and 38 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 93 and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Applicants have cancelled claims 93 and 94 rendering the rejections under 35 USC 112 moot. Claims 93 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have amended claim 49 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and submit that claim 49 is in condition for allowance. Claim 93 has been cancelled rendering the outstanding rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21, 28, 31, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Andonian. Claim 17 has been cancelled and its limitations incorporated into claim 1. Claim 35 has been cancelled and its limitations have been incorporated into claims 20, 38, and 39. The Applicants submit that claims 1, 20, 38, and 39 are not anticipated by Andonian. Claims 2, 9, 10, 13, and 14 depend from what is believed to be an allowable claim 1. Claims 21, 28, and 31 depend from what is believed to be an allowable claim 20. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21, 28, 31, 38, and 39 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 7, 25, 26, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 52, 53, 54, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Andonian and Stout et al. Claims 67, 68, 70, 71, 77,

DIP-307413 / DIP-0292 P

78, 81, 91 and 92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap. Claims 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian in view of Kaufmann et al and Demerly et al. Claim 42 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Stout as combined for claim 6 and further in view of Millsap. Claims 45-47, 55, 56, 50, 51, 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Stout et al as combined for claim 40 and further in view of Kaufmann and Demerly as combined with Andonian for claims 3-5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22-24, 29, 30 and 32-34. Claims 72-74, 79, 80 and 82-84 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap et al as combined for claim 67 and further in view of Kaufmann and Demerly as combined with Andonian for claims 3-5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22-24, 29, 30 and 32-34. Claims 75 and 76 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Andonian and Millsap as combined for claim 67 and further in view of Stout as combined with Andonian for claims 6, 7 and 40.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 17. Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 35. Claim 40 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 61. Claim 67 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 85. Claims 3-7, 11, 12, 15, and 16 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claims 22-26, 29, 30, and 32-34 depend from what should be an allowable claim 20. Claims 41-47, 49-56, and 58-60 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 40. Claims 72-76, 79, 80, and 82-84 depend from what should be an allowable claim 67. The Applicants submit that claims 3-7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22-26, 29, 30, 32-34, 41-47, 49-56, 58-60, 72-76, 79, 80, and 82-84 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons presented herein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

DP-307433 / DE3-0292-P

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By Marisa J. Dubuc

Marisa J. Dubuc

Registration No. 46,673

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 22851

Date: October 11, 2005